

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 18 2007

REMARKS

This is in response to the Examiner's Report of 05/02/2007.

In the Office Action Summary – **Application Papers**, the Drawings are objected to by the Examiner. However, there is no further reference to the Drawings in the Report. It appears that this Objection may be inadvertant.

Page 7 of the Specification has been replaced, wherein at line 20 the language has been conformed to that of Page 6 in regard to the "mid-section outer surfaces 28".

In the claims, Claim 1 has been cancelled, being replaced by new Claim 19.

The dependent claims 7, 9, 10, 13, 16-18 have been amended with introduction of the transition "wherein" linking the preamble with the claim limitation matter, and have been individually amended with a view to overcoming the 35 USC 112 objections.

Claim 19 sets out the subject structure in clear and specific terms, that the pairs of individual members form substantially diamond shaped enclosures that extend the length and breadth of the rectangular enclosure. This is in complete distinction to Leung (publication US 2002/0046514) who shows a structural panel unit wherein a central opening is provided by means of angled bracing members (e.g. Figs 3 & 4), and wherein Figure 1 shows a window opening supported by corner brace members.

In all of Leung's embodiments, his members are all multiple thickness units. There does not appear to be any recognition or teaching of using continuous reinforcing elements within his structure where the active length of his reinforcing elements is effectively reduced, so as to correspondingly increase the strut stiffness of the reinforcing element against loads that are applied to it. In contrast to Leung, the present invention shows pairs of reinforcing members that are deformed to occupy substantially all the frame interior, and where its members are braced intermediate their ends, to

provide shortened load-bearing elements better able to withstand compressive loads without buckling. In Leung his angled bracing members are secured together, forming straight load-bearing elements. This is apparently done to provide rigid frames with window apertures. The Leung structures are intricate and heavy, in contrast to the weight and wood-saving aspects of the present invention.

The Kirk (US 5,210,990) reference does not address the defects of Leung. Also, the rigid wooden channel of Kirk is clearly incapable of use in the manner of the present invention.

The Cable (US 4,325,054) metal studs are shown in use in the orthodox stud/frame fashion as straight, rectilinear load bearing members. Additional cross-brace members are used in order to reinforce the Cable structure.

Griffin (US 6,263,628) shows the use of panels with a slab foam core and C-stud side members to receive re-bar, the panel having a top recess for the positioning of re-bar and the pouring of a cement structure. There appears to be no teaching by Griffin (Col 6 lines 15-25) of the use of the foam core 12 to "resist lateral deformation of said studs", as referred to by the Examiner.

The other prior art made of record does not appear to redress the shortcomings of Leung as an anticipation of this invention, as now presented in the claims.

Consideration of the amended claims with a view to their allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted

D. Eggins. Regⁿ 21,175